

REMARKS

Applicant has added new claim 25. Claims 13-15 and 17-23 and 25 are pending in this application.

The Examiner stated that the replacement drawings received on September 11, 2003 have been accepted. Applicant thanks the Examiner for accepting the drawings.

The Examiner rejected claims 13-15, 17-21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being obvious over Admitted Art in view of Nagashima (US Patent No. 5742735) and Sarfaty (US Patent No. 5741171). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims which are being presented again without any amendment.

The Nagashima reference is cited by the Examiner for teaching a driving unit including driving means and a control unit which reads calculated pre-stored values of reference points from a mathematical controlling curve for directing the movement of the lens system. The Examiner then asserts that the drive unit of Nagashima can replace that of the Admitted Art. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant submits that the drive unit cannot replace the drive unit of the Admitted Art because the Admitted Art teaches a stereo microscope mechanism while the Nagashima drive unit teaches a video camera which is distinctly different. In the Nagashima video camera, the two lenses 2, 3 being moved are in the same axis and they move in parallel with each other along the same axis. By contrast, in a stereo microscope, a pair of lenses (see for example lens pair L1 in FIG. 2 of the present application) are on different axes and the two axes are not parallel to each other. For example, see F1 (axis for the left lens of L1) which is arranged at an angle relative to the axis for the right lens of L1. Thus, Admitted Art cannot be combined with the drive unit of Nagashima. Even if they could be combined, somehow, the combination cannot function to provide the lens

movement as required by claim 13.

In other words, the fact that a drive unit is used for a zoom system of a stereo microscope, rather than a video camera, should be given patentable weight.

The Examiner cited Sarfaty for the proposition that a direct linear drive motor is well known in moving lenses. Sarfaty discloses a polishing machine with a video microscope. The zoom of this microscope is described to be driven by a motor, but neither the description nor the figures describe any details about: 1) where the motor is situated; and 2) what is driven by the motor (a lens, lens group, or a handle for an ordinary zoom with a cam disc). At the time of the invention, microscopes were motorized by attaching a motor to the handle normally moved by hand for focus, zoom, etc. This can be seen in FIG. 1 for the movement in x and y. Moreover, since the drive unit of Nagashima cannot be combined with Admitted Art to provide the claimed invention, the combination of Admitted Art, Nagashima and Sarfaty still does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 13.

Dependent claims 14-15 and 17-23 are also patentable by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 13.

Applicant has added new claim 25 along the lines of claim 13. Claim 25 provides further differentiation from Nagashima's camera mechanism using a single axis for parallel lens movement by emphasizing the non-parallel nature of the two axes along which the pair of lenses move. Specifically, Claim 25 recites "at least one pair of moving lenses for stereo imaging and operable to move in a non-parallel manner with respect to each other".

None of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teach or suggest such a novel feature.

Based upon the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its earlier allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact him at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Harry K. Ahn, Reg. No. 40,243

GHK:HKA:ram
212 521-5400

Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022-7650